

From: Steven Long
To: Douglas Pickett
Date: 7/25/02 5:19PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: FENOC Response to RAI Question 1 d

Doug, As for me, any time next week except Friday and between 10:30 and 11:39 on Tuesday. Do we want to get anybody from RES involved? Steve

>>> Douglas Pickett 07/25/02 05:15PM >>>
Steve -

FENOC is ready to talk. I'll be out of the office tomorrow but give me your preferences for next week

Doug

6/108

From: <mriemer@firstenergycorp.com>
To: "Douglas Pickett" <DVP1@nrc.gov>
Date: 7/25/02 3 17PM
Subject: Re: Fwd. FENOC Response to RAI Question 1.d

Doug,

I spoke with our responsible individuals and they are pretty open to support a conference call. Since the consultants who performed the analysis are on the west coast, calls after 11:00 am are desired. If you suggest a time, we should be able to support it.

Mark

✓

"Douglas Pickett" To: <mriemer@firstenergycorp.com>
 <DVP1@nrc.gov> cc: <Dale_r_wuokko@firstenergycorp.com>, <Michael_k._leisure@firstenergycorp.com>, "Steven Long" <SML@nrc.gov>
 07/25/02 11:29 AM Subject Fwd FENOC Response to RAI Question 1.d

NPK

Mark -

The attached email from the NRR tech staff has a question concerning the July 20, 2002 submittal on the Safety Significance Assessment. We would like to schedule a conference call with the appropriate people to discuss the concern. Please let me know what can be worked out.

I would prefer to handle this as a simple background information type call as opposed to a formal RAI at this time.

Thanks - Doug

✓

----- Message from "Steven Long" <SML@nrc.gov> on Thu, 25 Jul 2002 11:14:09 -0400 -----

NPK

To: "Douglas Pickett" <DVP1@nrc.gov>

Subject: FENOC Response to RAI Question 1.d

Doug,

I read the FENOC response dated 7/20/02 and found that it was not actually responsive to the most important part of our question. We asked what the size the cavity would have to reach before its failure pressure would decrease to the plant's normal operating pressure. We specified consideration of two cladding thicknesses, the minimum allowed (0.125") and the average value actually found in the cavity (0.297"). They did provide an answer for the 0.125" case. However, they terminated their enlargement study at a cavity size with 4 times the as-found area, with the best estimate for the failure pressure with the as-found clad thickness still at 4172 psi. They did make a linear extrapolation for that clad thickness case to failure at 102.5 square inches of exposed clad. But the appearance of figures 6 and 7 indicate that extrapolation is highly unreliable because the failure pressure is not a linear function of exposed area. So it is not feasible even to say if that estimate is an over-prediction or an under-prediction..

The criterion for stopping the expansion calculations at 82 square inches is stated on page 4: "The decision to limit the cavity growth value to 4A for this evaluation is to ensure that Tube 11 is not fully exposed." However, no reason is provided for selecting that criterion.

Please ask the licensee to provide an explanation of the engineering considerations that caused them to stop the evaluation short of fully encompassing nozzle 11. It would be helpful if the explanation includes some discussion as to whether those engineering considerations would tend to make the cavity fail at a smaller or larger size than would estimates that exclude those considerations.

An e-mail response will be sufficient for my purposes.

Steve